VIJAY K. TOKE (CA Bar No. 215079)
(vijay@cobaltlaw.com)
MATTHEW S. SLEVIN (CA Bar No. 287968)
(matt@cobaltlaw.com)
COBALT LLP
918 Parker Street, Bldg. A21
Berkeley, CA 94710
Telephone: (510) 841-9800
Facsimile: (510) 295-2401

DAVID B. OWSLEY II (admitted *pro hac vice)*
(dowsley@stites.com)
MARI-ELISE GATES PAUL (admitted *pro hac vice)*
(mgates@stites.com)
STITES & HARBISON PLLC
400 West Market Street, Suite 1800
Louisville, KY 40202-3352
Telephone: (502) 587-3400
Facsimile: (502) 587-6391

MELISSA HUNTER SMITH (admitted *pro hac vice)*
(melissa.smith@stites.com)
STITES & HARBISON PLLC
401 Commerce Street, Suite 800
Nashville, TN 37219
Telephone: (615) 782-2283
Facsimile: (615) 742-0731

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counter-defendants
TECH 21 UK LIMITED and
TECH 21 LICENSING LIMITED

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

TECH 21 UK LIMITED, a UK company and TECH 21 LICENSING LIMITED, a UK company,

Plaintiffs,

v.

SPIGEN INC., a California corporation,

Defendant.

And Related Counterclaims.

Case No.: 3:15-cv-05059-RS

CONSENT JUDGMENT

This Civil Action has come before the Court, upon the pleadings and proceedings of record, and it has been represented to the Court that plaintiffs and counter-defendants Tech 21 UK Limited and Tech 21 Licensing Limited (together "Tech21") and defendant and counterclaimant Spigen Inc. ("Spigen"), have entered into a Settlement Agreement and have agreed to a final resolution of this case on the terms and conditions set forth below:

WHEREFORE, with the consent of the above-identified parties, through their undersigned attorneys, and with the approval of this Court,

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED, ADJUDGED AND DECREED AS FOLLOWS:

1. Tech21 filed its First Amended Complaint (Docket Number 30), asserting claims for (1) Trade Dress Infringement (15 U.S.C. § 1125(a)), (2) False Designation of Origin (15 U.S.C. §1125(a)), (3) Trade Dress Infringement (California Common Law), (4) Unfair Business Practices (Cal. Bus. & Prof. Code §17200), (5) Tortious Interference With Prospective Economic Relations (California Common Law).

2. Spigen filed its Answer and Counterclaims (Docket Number 34), asserting claims for declaratory judgment of non-infringement.

3. This Court has jurisdiction over the parties and the subject matter of this action.

4. Tech21 manufactures and sells a variety of protective cases and packaging to protect handheld mobile electronic devices.

5. Spigen manufactures and sells a variety of protective cases and packaging to protect handheld mobile electronic devices.

6. This Consent Judgment shall not be construed as an admission of liability by Spigen of any claims in the lawsuit, or otherwise. Any and all allegations of liability and wrongdoing are expressly denied by Spigen.

7. Effective as of the date of this Order, Spigen, and its respective affiliates, subsidiaries, distributors, officers, directors, agents, successors and assigns, and all persons in active concert or participation with them, are hereby permanently restrained and enjoined from:

/ / /

/ / /

(a) making, using, selling, offering for sale, and/or importing all SKUs of the Spigen Ultra Hybrid TECH referenced in paragraphs 22-24 of the First Amended Complaint;

(b) using Tech21's "Mark" as referenced in paragraph 21 of the First Amended Complaint or any mark or designation confusingly similar to Tech21's Mark; and

(c) making, using, selling, offering for sale, and/or importing protective cases that infringe the "Trade Dress" alleged in paragraphs 8-9 of the First Amended Complaint.

8. Additional terms are set forth in confidential **Exhibit A**, attached hereto under seal, the terms of which are incorporated herein by reference.

9. The Court retains jurisdiction to enforce the terms of this Judgment and those in Exhibit A.

10. This Consent Judgment represents a final resolution of the claims and counterclaims in this action. The entire action, including the Complaint and Counterclaims, shall be dismissed, and the clerk shall close the case.

/ / /

/ / /

CONSENTS, THROUGH COUNSEL OF RECORD

Dated: August 4, 2016

By: /s/Vijay K. Toke

Vijay K. Toke
Matthew S. Slevin
COBALT LLP

David B. Owsley II (admitted *pro hac vice)*
Mari-Elise Gates Paul (admitted *pro hac vice)*
Melissa Hunter Smith (admitted *pro hac vice)*
STITES & HARBISON PLLC

Attorneys for Plaintiffs and Counter-defendants
TECH 21 UK LIMITED and
TECH 21 LICENSING LIMITED

Dated: August 4, 2016

By: /s/Heedong Chae

Heedong Chae
Attorneys for Defendant and Counterclaimant,
SPIGEN, INC.

PURSUANT TO STIPULATION, IT IS SO ORDERED.

DATED: 8/29/16

Hon. Richard Seeborg
United States District Judge